arXiv:1605.07658v2 [physics.flu-dyn] 8 Jun 2016

Modeling flow in porous media with double porosity/permeability:
Mathematical model, properties, and analytical solutions

An e-print of the paper is available on arXiv: 1605.07658.

Authored by

K. B. Nakshatrala
Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering
University of Houston, Houston, Texas 77204–4003
phone: *+1-713-743-4418,* ***e-mail:*** *knakshatrala@uh.edu*
website: *http://www.cive.uh.edu/faculty/nakshatrala*

S. H. S. Joodat
Graduate Student, University of Houston

R. Ballarini
Thomas and Laura Hsu Professor and Chair
Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, University of Houston.



This figure numerically verifies the proposed maximum principle for the double porosity/permeability model, which implies that the difference in pressures in the macro-pore and micro-pore networks in the entire domain should lie between the non-negative maximum and the non-positive minimum values on the boundary. The parameter η is inversely proportional to the square root of the harmonic mean of the permeabilities in the macro-pore and micro-pore networks.

2016
Computational & Applied Mechanics Laboratory

Modeling flow in porous media with double porosity/permeability: Mathematical model, properties, and analytical solutions

K. B. Nakshatrala, **S. H. S. Joodat**, and **R. Ballarini**
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Houston.
Correspondence to: knakshatrala@uh.edu

Abstract. Geo-materials such as vuggy carbonates are known to exhibit multiple spatial scales. A common manifestation of spatial scales is the presence of (at least) two different scales of pores, which is commonly referred to as double porosity. To complicate things, the pore-network at each scale exhibits different permeability, and these networks are connected through fissure and conduits. Although some models are available in the literature, they lack a strong theoretical basis. This paper aims to fill this lacuna by providing the much needed theoretical foundations of the flow in porous media which exhibit double porosity/permeability. We first obtain a mathematical model for double porosity/permeability using the maximization of rate of dissipation hypothesis, and thereby providing a firm thermodynamic underpinning. We then present, along with mathematical proofs, several important mathematical properties that the solutions to the double porosity/permeability model satisfy. These properties are important in their own right as well as serve as good (mechanics-based) *a posteriori* measures to assess the accuracy of numerical solutions. We also present several canonical problems and obtain the corresponding analytical solutions, which are used to gain insights into the velocity and pressure profiles, and the mass transfer across the two pore-networks. In particular, we highlight how the solutions under the double porosity/permeability differ from the corresponding solutions under Darcy equations.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

Most models of flow in porous media make the simplifying assumption that the domain consists of a system of similar-sized pores connected by a single pore-network. In reality, many geo-materials exhibit two or more dominant pore-scales connected by multiple pore-networks [Borja and Koliji, 2009] that display significantly different hydro-mechanical properties such as disparate permeabilities and different orders of volume fractions. These differences in behavior have been discussed in the literature under the subject of either the dual-porosity or dual-permeability. Note that, "dual" and "double" have been used equivalently in the literature, as will be done in this paper. However, there is a subtle difference in the phenomena the two words describe, and therefore it is necessary to clarify what we mean by dual-porosity and dual-permeability models.

Key words and phrases. double porosity; double permeability; flow through porous media; mixture theories; maximum principles; Green's function; integral equations.

The main assumption in a *dual-porosity* model is that the permeability of the macro-pores is much greater than the permeability of the micro-pores, while the porosity of the former is much smaller than the porosity of the latter. In other words, fluid is mostly trapped within the micro-pores while macro-pores form the major fluid pathways due to their higher permeability. Hence, the liquid phase is divided into mobile and immobile regions with the possibility of fluid exchange between them [Šimunek et al., 2003; van Genuchten and Wierenga, 1976]. The first dual-porosity model is commonly attributed to [Barenblatt et al., 1960], and addressed the flow through a *fractured* porous medium. In this paper, a term has been introduced based on dimensional analysis arguments to account for the mass transfer across the two pore-scales (i.e., matrix pores and fissures). [Warren and Root, 1963] later introduced two parameters for characterizing dual-porosity media; one parameter measures the fluid capacitance in the macro-pores and the other accounts for the inter-porosity flow. [Dykhuizen, 1990] proposed a new nonlinear coupling term for double porosity based on the models proposed by [Barenblatt et al., 1960] and [Warren and Root, 1963]. This dual-porosity model, unlike the previous ones, accounts for the diffusion across pore-networks and is valid even for unsteady conditions.

In contrast to dual-porosity models, the term *dual-permeability* pertains to the case where the fluid flows through both micro-pores and macro-pores, and there can be mass transfer across the pore-networks [Balogun et al., 2007; Vogel et al., 2000]. Different approaches have been used to describe flow and transport using dual-permeability models. In some cases, the flow in both micro-pores and macro-pores has been described using similar governing equations, while in others, different formulations have been considered in the two pore-networks [Šimunek et al., 2003]. However, most of the works on dual-permeability have considered the macro-network to be *fractures* with much higher permeability than the micro-network.

Herein, we generalize by assuming that there are two pore-networks with their own porosity and permeability and there is a mass transfer across the pore-networks. The macro-network can be a network of fractures, or can be another pore-network. It is possible to identify the presence of multiple pore sizes using experimental techniques such as the Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) method [Lowell et al., 2012]. Moreover, the multiple pore-networks can be characterized using modern techniques like μ-CT [Stock, 2008]. We shall refer to the aforementioned general treatment as the "*double porosity/permeability model*". Figure 1 represents the fractured porous medium idealized by dual-porosity model as well as a porous medium with two pore-networks idealized by a double porosity/permeability model. The vertical and horizontal arrows represent the fluid pathways and the mass transfer within the domain. In the fractured porous medium idealized by dual-porosity model, the mass transfer can occur between matrix pores and the fractures, and the fluid mostly passes through the fissures due to their higher permeability. In the porous medium with two pore-networks, mass is transferred across the two pore-networks but in this case, both the micro-pores and the macro-pores provide the pathways for pore fluid.

Although various models have been developed for double porosity/permeability over the years, many of them are applicable to simple settings and are valid only under stringent conditions. For example, in many previously developed models the spatial variation of pressure within the pore-scales is neglected or the mass transfer term is not an accurate representation of reality. Some mathematically-oriented works derived dual-porosity models using the theory of mathematical homogenization (e.g., see [Amaziane and Pankratov, 2015; Arbogast et al., 1990; Boutin and Royer, 2015]). However, these papers did not address the relevant thermomechanical underpinning, and

did not provide a coherent framework that makes it possible to obtain generalizations of those models in such a way that the thermo-mechanics principles are satisfied. Most importantly, the presentations of prior works on double porosity/permeability seem rather ad hoc, especially with respect to the treatment of mass transfer across the pore-networks. This is one of the main hurdles researchers are faced with while generalizing the mathematical model to more complicated situations like multi-phase flows and considering the effect of deformation of the porous solid along with flow in multiple pore-networks. Herein, we put the double porosity/permeability model under a firm footing with strong thermodynamic and mathematical underpinnings. In particular, we give a firm basis for the mass transfer across the pore-networks, and a mathematical framework amenable to further generalizations of the model.

The basic philosophy in our modeling approach can be stated as follows: (a) there exist (at least) two different pore-networks; (b) each pore-network is assumed to be a continuum, and transport of mass and chemical species can occur within each pore-network; and (c) mass can be transferred between the pore-networks. The parameters and quantities in the model represent values that are averaged over a representative volume element (RVE) whose existence is either tacitly or explicitly assumed in most of the double porosity/permeability models. For simplicity, we will model the flow in both networks using similar governing equations (i.e., Darcy-type equations), but one can use different descriptions of flows in the different pore-networks.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines the governing equations for a double porosity/permeability model. Section 3 presents a mathematical framework for deriving porous media models using the maximization of rate of dissipation and volume fractions approach, and obtains the double porosity/permeability model as a special case. Several mathematical properties of this model are derived in Section 4. An analytical solution procedure is presented in Section 5. Several canonical problems along with their analytical solutions are given in Section 6. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section 7.

Throughout this paper, repeated indices do not imply summation.

2. MATHEMATICAL MODEL FOR DOUBLE POROSITY/PERMEABILITY

Consider a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, where "$nd$" denotes the number of spatial dimensions. The boundary $\partial\Omega$ is assumed to be piecewise smooth. Mathematically, $\partial\Omega := \mathrm{cl}(\Omega) - \Omega$, where $\mathrm{cl}(\cdot)$ denotes the set closure [Evans, 1998]. A spatial point in Ω is denoted by $\mathbf{x}$. The gradient and divergence operators with respect to $\mathbf{x}$ are, respectively, denoted by grad[$\cdot$] and div[$\cdot$]. The unit outward normal to the boundary is $\widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x})$.

We are interested in studying the flow of an incompressible fluid in a rigid porous medium that consists of two distinct pore-networks. These pore-networks are connected by conduits and/or fissures, and hence there can be mass transfer across the pore-networks. We shall refer to these two pore-networks as macro-pore and micro-pore networks, and identify them using subscripts 1 and 2, respectively. The permeability tensors for these pore-networks are denoted by $\mathbf{K}_1(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{K}_2(\mathbf{x})$, which are assumed to be anisotropic and spatially inhomogeneous second-order tensors. The porosities in these pore-networks are denoted by $\phi_1(\mathbf{x})$ and $\phi_2(\mathbf{x})$. As mentioned previously, we shall assume that the fluid is incompressible. The true density and the coefficient of viscosity of the fluid are denoted by γ and μ, respectively. The bulk densities in the macro-pores and micro-pores are, respectively, denoted by $\rho_1(\mathbf{x})$ and $\rho_2(\mathbf{x})$. That is,

$$\rho_1(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_1(\mathbf{x})\gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_2(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_2(\mathbf{x})\gamma \tag{1}$$

The pressure scalar fields in the macro-pore and micro-pore networks are, respectively, represented by $p_1(\mathbf{x})$ and $p_2(\mathbf{x})$. The true (or seepage) velocity vector fields in the two pore-networks are denoted by $\mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{x})$ and are associated with discharge (or Darcy) velocities denoted by $\mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{u}_2(\mathbf{x})$. The discharge velocities are related to the true velocities as follows:

$$\mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_1(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{u}_2(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_2(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{x}) \tag{2}$$

For the macro-pore network, we shall decompose the boundary into two parts: Γ_1^v and Γ_1^p. Γ_1^v denotes the part of the boundary on which the normal component of the velocity in the macro-pore network is prescribed. Γ_1^p is that part of the boundary on which the pressure in the macro-pore network is prescribed. Likewise, for the micro-pore network, the boundary is decomposed into two parts: Γ_2^v and Γ_2^p. For mathematical well-posedness, we assume that

$$\Gamma_1^v \cup \Gamma_1^p = \partial\Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_1^v \cap \Gamma_1^p = \emptyset \tag{3a}$$
$$\Gamma_2^v \cup \Gamma_2^p = \partial\Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_2^v \cap \Gamma_2^p = \emptyset \tag{3b}$$

The governing equations in terms of the true velocities can be written as follows:

$$\mu\phi_1^2\mathbf{K}_1^{-1}\mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{x}) + \phi_1 \text{grad}[p_1] = \rho_1\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{4a}$$
$$\mu\phi_2^2\mathbf{K}_2^{-1}\mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{x}) + \phi_2 \text{grad}[p_2] = \rho_2\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{4b}$$
$$\text{div}[\phi_1\mathbf{v}_1] = +\chi(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{4c}$$
$$\text{div}[\phi_2\mathbf{v}_2] = -\chi(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{4d}$$
$$\mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) = v_{n1}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_1^v \tag{4e}$$
$$\mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) = v_{n2}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_2^v \tag{4f}$$
$$p_1(\mathbf{x}) = p_{01}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_1^p \tag{4g}$$
$$p_2(\mathbf{x}) = p_{02}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_2^p \tag{4h}$$

where $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})$ is the specific body force, $\chi(\mathbf{x})$ is the mass transfer between the two pore-networks, $v_{n1}(\mathbf{x})$ is the prescribed normal component of the velocity on the boundary in the macro-pores, $v_{n2}(\mathbf{x})$ is the prescribed normal component of the velocity on the boundary in the micro-pores, $p_{01}(\mathbf{x})$ is the prescribed pressure on the boundary in the macro-pores, and $p_{02}(\mathbf{x})$ is the prescribed pressure on the boundary in the micro-pores. The mass transfer between the macro-pore and micro-pore networks is modeled as follows:

$$\chi(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{\beta}{\mu}(p_1(\mathbf{x}) - p_2(\mathbf{x})) \tag{5}$$

The above expression for the mass transfer, which can be traced back to [Barenblatt et al., 1960], was derived based on a dimensional analysis argument. In this equation, β depends on the pore structure and has dimensions of length. To provide a physical insight into β, consider that the two pore-networks are connected by conduits with radius R and length L. Then $\beta = R^2/8L$. If the two pore-networks are connected by fissures, which can be idealized as parallel plates with length L and separated by a width of h, then $\beta = h^2/12L$. These expressions are obtained by assuming Poiseuille flow in conduits and Couette flow in fissures. In reality, the two pore-networks can be connected by both conduits and fissures, and these connectors can even be tortuous.

An alternate form of the governing equations, which is particularly convenient for numerical formulations, is written as follows in terms of discharge velocities:

$$\mu \mathbf{K}_1^{-1}\mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x}) + \operatorname{grad}[p_1] = \gamma \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \text{in } \Omega \tag{6a}$$

$$\mu \mathbf{K}_2^{-1}\mathbf{u}_2(\mathbf{x}) + \operatorname{grad}[p_2] = \gamma \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \text{in } \Omega \tag{6b}$$

$$\operatorname{div}[\mathbf{u}_1] = +\chi(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \text{in } \Omega \tag{6c}$$

$$\operatorname{div}[\mathbf{u}_2] = -\chi(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \text{in } \Omega \tag{6d}$$

$$\mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_1 v_{n1}(\mathbf{x}) =: u_{n1}(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_1^v \tag{6e}$$

$$\mathbf{u}_2(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_2 v_{n2}(\mathbf{x}) =: u_{n2}(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_2^v \tag{6f}$$

$$p_1(\mathbf{x}) = p_{01}(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_1^p \tag{6g}$$

$$p_2(\mathbf{x}) = p_{02}(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_2^p \tag{6h}$$

3. MAXIMIZATION OF RATE OF DISSIPATION FOR MIXTURE THEORIES

We now provide a thermodynamic basis for the double porosity/permeability model. Specifically, we derive the double porosity/permeability equations using the maximization of rate of dissipation hypothesis by taking the mass transfer between the pore-networks as an internal variable. Under the hypothesis, one needs to construct Helmholtz functionals for each constituent and one dissipation functional.

The porous medium is treated as a mixture of constituents. We restrict our representation to two fluid constituents, which correspond to fluids in the macro-pore and micro-pore networks. However, it should be noted that there are three constituents in total, as porous solid is also considered a constituent. We shall assume that the porous solid is rigid. Hence there is no need to document the balance laws for the porous solid, as they are trivially satisfied. Thus, the mixture is treated as a superposition of two single continua each following its own motion. At a given instance of time, each spatial point $\mathbf{x}$ in the mixture is occupied simultaneously by two different particles $\mathbf{p}_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$, one from each constituent. The motion of the two fluid constituents can be written as:

$$\mathbf{x} = \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i(\mathbf{p}_i, t) \tag{7}$$

The gradients of motion for the two fluid constituents are denoted by $\mathbf{F}_1$ and $\mathbf{F}_2$. That is,

$$\mathbf{F}_1 = \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{F}_2 = \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{p}_2} \tag{8}$$

Let

$$\mathbf{D}_1 := \frac{1}{2}\left(\operatorname{grad}[\mathbf{v}_1] + \operatorname{grad}[\mathbf{v}_1]^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{D}_2 := \frac{1}{2}\left(\operatorname{grad}[\mathbf{v}_2] + \operatorname{grad}[\mathbf{v}_2]^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \tag{9}$$

where $\operatorname{grad}[\cdot]$ is the gradient with respect to spatial coordinates $\mathbf{x}$. The Cauchy stresses of the two fluid constituents are denoted by $\mathbf{T}_1$ and $\mathbf{T}_2$. In mixture theories, the mechanical interaction between constituents is modeled using interaction terms [Atkin and Craine, 1976]. Herein, we denote the interaction term for the macro-pore network due to the presence of the micro-pore network by $\mathbf{i}_1$. Likewise, the interaction term for the micro-pore network is denoted by $\mathbf{i}_2$. We shall denote the specific Helmholtz potentials for the two fluid constituents by A_1 and A_2. The fluids in both networks are assumed to be incompressible. The entire presentation in the rest of this section will be restricted to quasi-static response.

The balance of mass for the fluid constituents in the macro-pore and micro-pore networks can respectively be written as follows:

$$\operatorname{div}[\phi_1 \mathbf{v}_1] = +\chi \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{div}[\phi_2 \mathbf{v}_2] = -\chi \tag{10}$$

where χ is taken as the rate of mass transfer from the macro-pore network to the micro-pore network. Assuming the balance of mass holds for the two fluid constituents, the balance of linear momentum for each constituent reads:

$$\operatorname{div}[\mathbf{T}_1] + \rho_1 \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{i}_1 = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{div}[\mathbf{T}_2] + \rho_2 \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{i}_2 = \mathbf{0} \tag{11}$$

Under isothermal conditions, the reduced energy dissipation equation reads:

$$-\left(\mathbf{T}_1 - \rho_1 \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial \mathbf{F}_1}\mathbf{F}_1^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \cdot \mathbf{D}_1 - \left(\mathbf{T}_2 - \rho_2 \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial \mathbf{F}_2}\mathbf{F}_2^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \cdot \mathbf{D}_2 + \mathbf{i}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{i}_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_2 + \zeta = 0 \tag{12}$$

where ζ is the rate of dissipation density functional. A local form of the second law of thermodynamics implies that $\zeta \geq 0$. We derive the constituent relations for the Cauchy stresses, interaction terms, and the rate of mass transfer across the pore-networks using the maximization of rate of dissipation hypothesis. By taking χ as an internal variable, the mathematical statement of the maximization of rate of dissipation hypothesis for multi-constituent media can be written as follows:

$$\underset{\mathbf{D}_1, \mathbf{D}_2, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \chi}{\text{maximize}} \quad \zeta = \widehat{\zeta}(\mathbf{D}_1, \mathbf{D}_2, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \chi) \tag{13a}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad -\left(\mathbf{T}_1 - \rho_1 \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial \mathbf{F}_1}\mathbf{F}_1^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \cdot \mathbf{D}_1 - \left(\mathbf{T}_2 - \rho_2 \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial \mathbf{F}_2}\mathbf{F}_2^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \cdot \mathbf{D}_2 + \mathbf{i}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{i}_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_2 + \zeta = 0 \tag{13b}$$

$$\phi_1 \operatorname{tr}[\mathbf{D}_1] + \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \operatorname{grad}[\phi_1] = +\chi \tag{13c}$$

$$\phi_2 \operatorname{tr}[\mathbf{D}_2] + \mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \operatorname{grad}[\phi_2] = -\chi \tag{13d}$$

Using the Lagrange multiplier method, one can rewrite the above constrained optimization problem as the following unconstrained optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned}\underset{\mathbf{D}_1, \mathbf{D}_2, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \chi, p_1, p_2, \lambda}{\text{extremize}} \quad & \zeta + p_1 \left(\phi_1 \operatorname{tr}[\mathbf{D}_1] + \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \operatorname{grad}[\phi_1] - \chi\right) + p_2 \left(\phi_2 \operatorname{tr}[\mathbf{D}_2] + \mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \operatorname{grad}[\phi_2] + \chi\right) \\ & + \lambda \left(-\left(\mathbf{T}_1 - \rho_1 \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial \mathbf{F}_1}\mathbf{F}_1^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \cdot \mathbf{D}_1 - \left(\mathbf{T}_2 - \rho_2 \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial \mathbf{F}_2}\mathbf{F}_2^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \cdot \mathbf{D}_2 + \mathbf{i}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{i}_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_2 + \zeta\right)\end{aligned} \tag{14a}$$

where λ is the Lagrange multiplier corresponding to the reduced energy dissipation equation (13b), and p_1 and p_2 are the Lagrange multipliers enforcing equations (13c) and (13d), respectively. The first-order optimality conditions of the above optimization problem yield:

$$\mathbf{T}_1 = -\phi_1 p_1 \mathbf{I} + \rho_1 \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial \mathbf{F}_1}\mathbf{F}_1^{\mathrm{T}} + \left(\frac{\lambda + 1}{\lambda}\right) \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial \mathbf{D}_1} \tag{15a}$$

$$\mathbf{T}_2 = -\phi_2 p_2 \mathbf{I} + \rho_2 \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial \mathbf{F}_2}\mathbf{F}_2^{\mathrm{T}} + \left(\frac{\lambda + 1}{\lambda}\right) \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial \mathbf{D}_2} \tag{15b}$$

$$\mathbf{i}_1 = \operatorname{grad}[\phi_1]\, p_1 - \left(\frac{\lambda + 1}{\lambda}\right) \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial \mathbf{v}_1} \tag{15c}$$

$$\mathbf{i}_2 = \operatorname{grad}[\phi_2]\, p_2 - \left(\frac{\lambda + 1}{\lambda}\right) \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial \mathbf{v}_2} \tag{15d}$$

$$\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial \chi} = -(p_1 - p_2) \tag{15e}$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ denotes the second-order identity tensor. Of course, one needs to augment the aforementioned optimality conditions with the constraints given by equations (13b)–(13d). Equations (15a)–(15e) provide general constitutive relations. One can obtain a specific constitutive model by specifying A_1, A_2, and ζ functionals. Moreover, if ζ is a homogeneous functional of order two with respect to its arguments, it can be shown that $\lambda = -2$.

One can obtain the double porosity/permeability model (as given in Section 2) by making the following choices for the functionals A_1, A_2, and ζ:

(i) The specific Helmholtz potentials for the two fluid constituents are taken as follows:

$$A_1 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 = 0 \tag{16}$$

(ii) The rate of dissipation production is taken as follows:

$$\zeta = \mu\phi_1^2 \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{K}_1^{-1}\mathbf{v}_1 + \mu\phi_2^2 \mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \mathbf{K}_2^{-1}\mathbf{v}_2 + \zeta_{\mathrm{MT}}(\chi) \tag{17}$$

where the first and second terms on the right-hand side of the equation, respectively, represent the rate of dissipation in the macro-pore and micro-pore networks, and ζ_{MT} accounts for the dissipation due to mass transfer across the two pore-networks.

(iii) Assuming that the connectors are conduits or fissures, ζ_{MT} can be taken as follows:

$$\zeta_{\mathrm{MT}}(\chi) = \frac{\mu}{\beta}\chi^2 \tag{18}$$

where β is a characteristic length parameter related to the connectors, as mentioned in Section 2. Noting the above choice for ζ_{MT}, it is easy to check that the functional ζ given by equation (17) is a homogeneous functional of order two of its arguments.

By substituting the above constitutive specifications into equations (15a)–(15e), one obtains the following constitutive relations:

$$\mathbf{T}_1 = -\phi_1 p_1 \mathbf{I}, \quad \mathbf{T}_2 = -\phi_2 p_2 \mathbf{I}, \quad \mathbf{i}_1 = \mu\phi_1^2 \mathbf{K}_1^{-1}\mathbf{v}_1, \quad \mathbf{i}_2 = \mu\phi_2^2 \mathbf{K}_2^{-1}\mathbf{v}_2, \quad \chi = -(p_1 - p_2) \tag{19}$$

The above constitutive relations along with the balance of mass and the balance of linear momentum give rise to the following equations:

$$\mu\phi_1^2 \mathbf{K}_1^{-1}\mathbf{v}_1 + \phi_1 \mathrm{grad}\,[p_1] = \rho_1 \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \tag{20a}$$

$$\mu\phi_2^2 \mathbf{K}_2^{-1}\mathbf{v}_2 + \phi_2 \mathrm{grad}\,[p_2] = \rho_2 \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \tag{20b}$$

$$\mathrm{div}[\phi_1 \mathbf{v}_1] = +\chi \tag{20c}$$

$$\mathrm{div}[\phi_2 \mathbf{v}_2] = -\chi \tag{20d}$$

$$\chi = -\frac{\beta}{\mu}(p_1 - p_2) \tag{20e}$$

which are the governing equations under the double porosity/permeability model.

3.1. Generalizations. The above framework offers an attractive setting for deriving porous media models in a consistent manner. It is possible to obtain generalizations of the double porosity/permeability model, but it is beyond the scope of this paper. We do discuss the generalization of the Brinkman model [Brinkman, 1947] to incorporate double pore-networks and the mass transfer across the pore-networks. To this end, we make the following choices for the specific Helmholtz potentials and dissipation functional:

$$A_1 = A_2 = 0 \tag{21a}$$

$$\zeta = \mu\phi_1^2 \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{K}_1^{-1}\mathbf{v}_1 + \mu\phi_1 \mathbf{D}_1 \cdot \mathbf{D}_1 + \mu\phi_2^2 \mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \mathbf{K}_2^{-1}\mathbf{v}_2 + \mu\phi_2 \mathbf{D}_2 \cdot \mathbf{D}_2 + \zeta_{\rm MT} \tag{21b}$$

$$\zeta_{\rm MT} = \frac{\mu}{\beta}\chi^2 \tag{21c}$$

A physical justification of the above choice for ζ is as follows: the first term models the dissipation due to friction at the interface of the porous solid and the fluid in the macro-pore network. The second term corresponds to the dissipation due to friction in the internal layers of the fluid in the macro-pore network. The third and fourth terms model the corresponding phenomena in the micro-pore network. The fifth term models the dissipation due to mass transfer in the connectors. The above choices give rise to the following constitutive relations:

$$\mathbf{T}_1 = -\phi_1 p_1 \mathbf{I} + 2\mu\phi_1 \mathbf{D}_1, \quad \mathbf{T}_2 = -\phi_2 p_2 \mathbf{I} + 2\mu\phi_2 \mathbf{D}_2, \quad \mathbf{i}_1 = \mu\phi_1^2 \mathbf{K}_1^{-1}\mathbf{v}_1, \quad \mathbf{i}_2 = \mu\phi_2^2 \mathbf{K}_2^{-1}\mathbf{v}_2 \tag{22}$$

The balance of linear momentum for the two pore-networks becomes:

$$\mu\phi_1^2 \mathbf{K}_1^{-1}\mathbf{v}_1 + \operatorname{grad}[\phi_1 p_1] - \operatorname{div}[2\mu\phi_1 \mathbf{D}_1] = \rho_1 \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \tag{23a}$$

$$\mu\phi_2^2 \mathbf{K}_2^{-1}\mathbf{v}_2 + \operatorname{grad}[\phi_2 p_2] - \operatorname{div}[2\mu\phi_2 \mathbf{D}_2] = \rho_2 \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \tag{23b}$$

The equations for the balance of mass for the two pore-networks and the rate of mass transfer across the pore-networks (i.e., equations (20c), (20d) and (20e)) remain the same. These governing equations provide a consistent generalization of the classical Brinkman model and the double porosity/permeability model.

4. MATHEMATICAL PROPERTIES

In this section, we shall establish various mathematical properties that are satisfied by the solutions to the double porosity/permeability model. These results are of very high theoretical significance. In addition, they can serve as valuable mechanics-based *a posteriori* measures of the accuracy of numerical solutions of the governing equations. The latter aspect will be illustrated in a sequel paper. We now introduce the required mathematical machinery.

The body force is said to be a conservative vector field if there exists a scalar field ψ such that

$$\gamma \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = -\operatorname{grad}[\psi]$$

We shall assume a pair of vector fields $(\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_1, \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_2)$ to be *kinematically admissible* if the following conditions are met:

$$\operatorname{div}[\phi_1 \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_1] + \operatorname{div}[\phi_2 \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_2] = 0 \tag{24a}$$

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_1(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) = v_{n1}(\mathbf{x}) \tag{24b}$$

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_2(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) = v_{n2}(\mathbf{x}) \tag{24c}$$

Note that a kinematically admissible pair need not satisfy the governing equations for the balance of linear momentum for each pore-network (i.e., equations (4a) and (4b)), or the pressure boundary conditions (i.e., equations (4g) and (4h)). Moreover, it is important to note that the kinematically admissible pair need not satisfy the mass balance equations *individually* (i.e., equations (4c) and (4d)). We shall assume $(\mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{x}))$ to be the pair of true velocity fields if they satisfy all the governing equations under the double porosity/permeability model (i.e., equations (4a)–(4h)). For convenience, we shall denote

$$\alpha_1 = \mu\phi_1^2 \mathbf{K}_1^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_2 = \mu\phi_2^2 \mathbf{K}_2^{-1} \tag{25}$$

Recently, it has been shown that the solutions to the classical Darcy equations satisfy a minimum principle with respect to the mechanical dissipation [Shabouei and Nakshatrala, 2016]. Herein, we shall extend this result to the double porosity/permeability model.

THEOREM 4.1. *[Minimum dissipation theorem] Assume that velocity boundary conditions are enforced on the entire boundary (i.e., $\Gamma_1^v = \Gamma_2^v = \partial\Omega$). Moreover, $\gamma\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})$ is assumed to be a conservative vector field. The dissipation functional is defined as follows:*

$$\mathbf{\Phi}\left[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2\right] := \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left(\int_\Omega \alpha_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \mathrm{d}\Omega + \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \frac{\mu}{\beta} \mathrm{div}\left[\phi_i \mathbf{v}_i\right] \mathrm{div}\left[\phi_i \mathbf{v}_i\right] \mathrm{d}\Omega \right) \tag{26}$$

Then every kinematically admissible pair $(\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_1(\mathbf{x}), \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_2(\mathbf{x}))$ satisfies

$$\mathbf{\Phi}\left[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2\right] \leq \mathbf{\Phi}\left[\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_1, \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_2\right] \tag{27}$$

where $(\mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{x}))$ denotes the pair of true velocity vector fields. To put it differently, the pair of true velocity vector fields admits the minimum total dissipation among all the possible pairs of kinematically admissible vector fields.

PROOF. Let

$$\delta\mathbf{v}_i(\mathbf{x}) := \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_i(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{v}_i(\mathbf{x}) \tag{28}$$

Clearly, $\delta\mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{x})$ and $\delta\mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{x})$ satisfy

$$\mathrm{div}\left[\phi_1 \delta\mathbf{v}_1\right] + \mathrm{div}\left[\phi_2 \delta\mathbf{v}_2\right] = 0, \quad \delta\mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \quad \delta\mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \tag{29}$$

Now consider

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Phi}\left[\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_1, \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_2\right] - \mathbf{\Phi}\left[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2\right] = &\sum_{i=1}^{2} \left(\int_\Omega \alpha_i \delta\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \delta\mathbf{v}_i \mathrm{d}\Omega + \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \frac{\mu}{\beta} \left(\mathrm{div}\left[\phi_i \delta\mathbf{v}_i\right]\right)^2 \mathrm{d}\Omega \right) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left(2 \int_\Omega \alpha_i \delta\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \mathrm{d}\Omega + \int_\Omega \frac{\mu}{\beta} \mathrm{div}\left[\phi_i \delta\mathbf{v}_i\right] \mathrm{div}\left[\phi_i \mathbf{v}_i\right] \mathrm{d}\Omega \right) \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Noting that the first two terms on the right side of the above equation are non-negative, we have

$$\mathbf{\Phi}\left[\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_1, \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_2\right] - \mathbf{\Phi}\left[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2\right] \geq \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left(2 \int_\Omega \alpha_i \delta\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \mathrm{d}\Omega + \int_\Omega \frac{\mu}{\beta} \mathrm{div}\left[\phi_i \delta\mathbf{v}_i\right] \mathrm{div}\left[\phi_i \mathbf{v}_i\right] \mathrm{d}\Omega \right) \tag{31}$$

Using the balance of linear momentum for each pore-network (i.e., equations (4a) and (4b)), noting that $\gamma\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = -\mathrm{grad}[\psi]$, and employing Green's identity, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Phi}\left[\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_1, \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_2\right] - \mathbf{\Phi}\left[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2\right] \geq &-2 \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left(\int_{\partial\Omega} \phi_i \delta\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) \left(\psi + p_i\right) \mathrm{d}\Gamma \right) + 2 \int_\Omega \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2} \mathrm{div}\left[\phi_i \delta\mathbf{v}_i\right] \right) \psi \mathrm{d}\Omega \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left(2 \int_\Omega \mathrm{div}\left[\phi_i \delta\mathbf{v}_i\right] p_i \mathrm{d}\Omega + \int_\Omega \frac{\mu}{\beta} \mathrm{div}\left[\phi_i \delta\mathbf{v}_i\right] \mathrm{div}\left[\phi_i \mathbf{v}_i\right] \mathrm{d}\Omega \right) \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Using equation (29) we have

$$\mathbf{\Phi}\left[\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_1, \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_2\right] - \mathbf{\Phi}\left[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2\right] \geq \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left(2 \int_\Omega \mathrm{div}\left[\phi_i \delta\mathbf{v}_i\right] p_i \mathrm{d}\Omega + \int_\Omega \frac{\mu}{\beta} \mathrm{div}\left[\phi_i \delta\mathbf{v}_i\right] \mathrm{div}\left[\phi_i \mathbf{v}_i\right] \mathrm{d}\Omega \right) \tag{33}$$

Using equations (4c) and (4d), we obtain

$$\mathbf{\Phi}\left[\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_1, \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_2\right] - \mathbf{\Phi}\left[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2\right] \geq \int_\Omega \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2} \operatorname{div}\left[\phi_i \delta \mathbf{v}_i\right]\right)(p_1 + p_2)\mathrm{d}\Omega \tag{34}$$

Invoking equation $(29)_1$ gives the desired result. □

REMARK 4.1. *It should be noted that the minimum dissipation theorem is not at odds with the maximization of the rate of dissipation hypothesis, which we discussed in the previous section. The minimum dissipation theorem seeks the minimum among the set of kinematically admissible vector fields. On the other hand, the maximization of rate of dissipation hypothesis maximizes the rate of dissipation among the set of all the fields that satisfy the first and second laws of thermodynamics.*

THEOREM 4.2. *[Uniqueness] The solution under the double porosity/permeability model is unique.*

PROOF. On the contrary, assume that $\left(\mathbf{v}_1^{'}, \mathbf{v}_2^{'}, p_1^{'}, p_2^{'}, \chi^{'}\right)$ and $(\mathbf{v}_1^*, \mathbf{v}_2^*, p_1^*, p_2^*, \chi^*)$ are two sets of solutions. Now consider the following quantity, which is a sum of three non-negative integrals:

$$\mathcal{I} := \int_\Omega \alpha_1 \left(\mathbf{v}_1^{'} - \mathbf{v}_1^*\right) \cdot \left(\mathbf{v}_1^{'} - \mathbf{v}_1^*\right) \mathrm{d}\Omega + \int_\Omega \alpha_2 \left(\mathbf{v}_2^{'} - \mathbf{v}_2^*\right) \cdot \left(\mathbf{v}_2^{'} - \mathbf{v}_2^*\right) \mathrm{d}\Omega + \int_\Omega \frac{\mu}{\beta} \left(\chi^{'} - \chi^*\right)^2 \mathrm{d}\Omega \tag{35}$$

We start by simplifying the first integral. Noting that both $\mathbf{v}_1^{'}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{v}_1^*(\mathbf{x})$ satisfy the balance of linear momentum for the macro-pore network (i.e., equation (4a)), and using Green's identity, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \alpha_1 \left(\mathbf{v}_1^{'} - \mathbf{v}_1^*\right) \cdot \left(\mathbf{v}_1^{'} - \mathbf{v}_1^*\right) \mathrm{d}\Omega = \int_\Omega \left(p_1^{'} - p_1^*\right) \operatorname{div}\left[\phi_1 \left(\mathbf{v}_1^{'} - \mathbf{v}_1^*\right)\right] \mathrm{d}\Omega - \int_{\Gamma_1^p} \left(p_1^{'} - p_1^*\right) \phi_1 \left(\mathbf{v}_1^{'} - \mathbf{v}_1^*\right) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) \mathrm{d}\Gamma \\ - \int_{\Gamma_1^v} \left(p_1^{'} - p_1^*\right) \phi_1 \left(\mathbf{v}_1^{'} - \mathbf{v}_1^*\right) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) \mathrm{d}\Gamma\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Noting that $p_1^{'}(\mathbf{x}) = p_1^*(\mathbf{x}) = p_{01}(\mathbf{x})$ on Γ_1^p, $\mathbf{v}_1^{'}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{v}_1^*(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) = v_{n1}(\mathbf{x})$ on Γ_1^v, and using equation (4c), we obtain

$$\int_\Omega \alpha_1 \left(\mathbf{v}_1^{'} - \mathbf{v}_1^*\right) \cdot \left(\mathbf{v}_1^{'} - \mathbf{v}_1^*\right) \mathrm{d}\Omega = \int_\Omega \left(p_1^{'} - p_1^*\right) \left(\chi^{'} - \chi^*\right) \mathrm{d}\Omega \tag{37}$$

A similar simplification of the second integral gives:

$$\int_\Omega \alpha_2 \left(\mathbf{v}_2^{'} - \mathbf{v}_2^*\right) \cdot \left(\mathbf{v}_2^{'} - \mathbf{v}_2^*\right) \mathrm{d}\Omega = -\int_\Omega \left(p_2^{'} - p_2^*\right) \left(\chi^{'} - \chi^*\right) \mathrm{d}\Omega \tag{38}$$

Note that

$$p_1^{'}(\mathbf{x}) - p_2^{'}(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{\mu}{\beta}\chi^{'}(\mathbf{x}), \quad p_1^*(\mathbf{x}) - p_2^*(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{\mu}{\beta}\chi^*(\mathbf{x}) \tag{39}$$

Equations (37), (38) and (39) imply that $\mathcal{I} = 0$. Since each integral and each integrand in $\mathcal{I}$ is non-negative, we conclude that

$$\mathbf{v}_1^{'}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{v}_1^*(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{v}_2^{'}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{v}_2^*(\mathbf{x}), \quad \chi^{'}(\mathbf{x}) = \chi^*(\mathbf{x})$$

and thus the uniqueness of the solution can be established. □

Few remarks about the uniqueness theorem are in order.

REMARK 4.2. *Unlike the minimum dissipation theorem, the uniqueness theorem does not require the velocity boundary conditions to be prescribed on the entire boundary. That is, the uniqueness has been established under the general boundary conditions, which are given by equations (4e)–(4h).*

REMARK 4.3. *The mechanics basis in the proof for the uniqueness will be evident by noting that the integral $\mathcal{I}$, which is defined in equation (35), is related to the physical dissipation functional, $\mathbf{\Phi}$, defined in equation (26), for the solution fields. That is,*

$$\mathcal{I} = \Phi[\mathbf{v}_1^{'} - \mathbf{v}_1^{*}, \mathbf{v}_2^{'} - \mathbf{v}_2^{*}]$$

if $\left(\mathbf{v}_1^{'}, \mathbf{v}_2^{'}, p_1^{'}, p_2^{'}, \chi^{'}\right)$ *and* $(\mathbf{v}_1^{*}, \mathbf{v}_2^{*}, p_1^{*}, p_2^{*}, \chi^{*})$ *are the solutions of the double porosity/permeability model. In general, $\mathcal{I}$ is not equal to $\Phi[\mathbf{v}_1^{'} - \mathbf{v}_1^{*}, \mathbf{v}_2^{'} - \mathbf{v}_2^{*}]$. One can alternatively employ the mathematical tools from functional analysis to establish uniqueness. Herein, uniqueness was established using mechanics-based arguments, and hence, it is believed that the above proof will have some pedagogical value in engineering education.*

Reciprocal relations are popular in several branches of mechanics. For example, Betti's reciprocal relation is a classical result in elasticity [Love, 1920]. Its utility to solve a class of seemingly difficult boundary value problems in linear elasticity is well-documented in the literature; for example, see [Love, 1920; Sadd, 2009]. Recently, reciprocal relations have been obtained for Darcy and Darcy-Brinkman equations in [Shabouei and Nakshatrala, 2016]. It should, however, be noted that the kinematically admissible fields in the aforementioned cases (i.e., elasticity, Darcy and Darcy-Brinkman equations) are different from that of the double porosity/permeability model.

THEOREM 4.3. *[Reciprocal relation] Let $(\mathbf{v}_1^{'}, p_1^{'}, \mathbf{v}_2^{'}, p_2^{'})$ and $(\mathbf{v}_1^{*}, p_1^{*}, \mathbf{v}_2^{*}, p_2^{*})$ be, respectively, the solutions under the prescribed data-sets $(\mathbf{b}^{'}, v_{n1}^{'}, p_{01}^{'}, v_{n2}^{'}, p_{02}^{'})$ and $(\mathbf{b}^{*}, v_{n1}^{*}, p_{01}^{*}, v_{n2}^{*}, p_{02}^{*})$. The domain, Ω, and the boundaries, Γ_1^v, Γ_1^p, Γ_2^v, and Γ_2^p, are the same for both prescribed data-sets. The pair of solutions and the pair of prescribed data-sets satisfy the following reciprocal relation:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \phi_1(\mathbf{x})\gamma\mathbf{b}^{'}(\mathbf{x})\cdot\mathbf{v}_1^{*}(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\Omega - \int_{\Gamma_1^p}\phi_1(\mathbf{x})p_{01}^{'}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{v}_1^{*}(\mathbf{x})\cdot\widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_1^v}\phi_1(\mathbf{x})p_1^{'}(\mathbf{x})v_{n1}^{*}(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma \\
&+\int_\Omega \phi_2(\mathbf{x})\gamma\mathbf{b}^{'}(\mathbf{x})\cdot\mathbf{v}_2^{*}(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\Omega - \int_{\Gamma_2^p}\phi_2(\mathbf{x})p_{02}^{'}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{v}_2^{*}(\mathbf{x})\cdot\widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_2^v}\phi_2(\mathbf{x})p_2^{'}(\mathbf{x})v_{n2}^{*}(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma \\
&=\int_\Omega \phi_1(\mathbf{x})\gamma\mathbf{b}^{*}(\mathbf{x})\cdot\mathbf{v}_1^{'}(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\Omega - \int_{\Gamma_1^p}\phi_1(\mathbf{x})p_{01}^{*}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{v}_1^{'}(\mathbf{x})\cdot\widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_1^v}\phi_1(\mathbf{x})p_1^{*}(\mathbf{x})v_{n1}^{'}(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma \\
&+\int_\Omega \phi_2(\mathbf{x})\gamma\mathbf{b}^{*}(\mathbf{x})\cdot\mathbf{v}_2^{'}(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\Omega - \int_{\Gamma_2^p}\phi_2(\mathbf{x})p_{02}^{*}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{v}_2^{'}(\mathbf{x})\cdot\widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_2^v}\phi_2(\mathbf{x})p_2^{*}(\mathbf{x})v_{n2}^{'}(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\Gamma
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

PROOF. Using equations (4a)–(4h) and (5), and invoking Green's identity, one can show that each side of the equality in equation (40) is:

$$\int_\Omega \alpha_1\mathbf{v}_1^{'}(\mathbf{x})\cdot\mathbf{v}_1^{*}(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\Omega + \int_\Omega \alpha_2\mathbf{v}_2^{'}(\mathbf{x})\cdot\mathbf{v}_2^{*}(\mathbf{x})\,\mathrm{d}\Omega + \int_\Omega \frac{\beta}{\mu}(p_1^{'}-p_2^{'})(p_1^{*}-p_2^{*})\,\mathrm{d}\Omega$$

This completes the proof. □

4.1. Maximum principle. Maximum principle is one of the basic qualitative properties of second-order elliptic partial differential equations. It can be shown that the pressure under Darcy equations satisfy a maximum principle, which is valid even for heterogeneous and anisotropic permeabilities. To wit, assuming that the pressure boundary conditions are prescribed on the entire boundary, Darcy equations can be rewritten as follows:

$$-\mathrm{div}\left[\frac{1}{\mu}\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{grad}[p+\psi]\right] = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{41a}$$

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = p_0(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \text{on } \partial\Omega \tag{41b}$$

The above boundary value problem is a second-order elliptic partial differential equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions prescribed on the entire boundary. From the theory of partial differential equations [Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001], the pressure satisfies:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\partial\Omega}[p_0(\mathbf{x})] \leq p(\mathbf{x}) \leq \max_{\mathbf{x}\in\partial\Omega}[p_0(\mathbf{x}))] \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \overline{\Omega} \tag{42}$$

That is, the maximum and minimum pressures occur on the boundary.

On the contrary, the macro- and micro-pressures under the double porosity/permeability model do not individually enjoy such a maximum principle. One can, however, establish a maximum principle for the difference in pressures in the macro-pore and micro-pore networks under some restrictions on the nature of permeabilities and boundary conditions.

THEOREM 4.4. *[Maximum principle] Assume that the permeabilities are isotropic and homogeneous. That is,* $\mathbf{K}_1(\mathbf{x}) = k_1\mathbf{I}$ *and* $\mathbf{K}_2(\mathbf{x}) = k_2\mathbf{I}$*, where* $\mathbf{I}$ *is the second-order identity tensor. The entire boundary is prescribed with pressure boundary conditions. That is,* $\Gamma_1^p = \Gamma_2^p = \partial\Omega$*. The domain* Ω *is bounded and the boundary is smooth. Then the pressure difference in the macro-pore and micro-pore networks,* $p_1(\mathbf{x}) - p_2(\mathbf{x})$*, everywhere satisfies:*

$$\min\left[0, \min_{\mathbf{x}\in\partial\Omega}[p_{01}(\mathbf{x}) - p_{02}(\mathbf{x})]\right] \leq p_1(\mathbf{x}) - p_2(\mathbf{x}) \leq \max\left[0, \max_{\mathbf{x}\in\partial\Omega}[p_{01}(\mathbf{x}) - p_{02}(\mathbf{x})]\right] \tag{43}$$

The maximum principle for the double porosity/permeability model basically implies that the pressure difference in the micro-pore and macro-pore networks everywhere in the domain lies between the corresponding non-negative maximum and the non-positive minimum values on the boundary on which pressures are prescribed.

PROOF. Noting that the permeabilities are isotropic and homogeneous, equations (4a)–(4f) give rise to the following boundary value problem:

$$\beta\left(\frac{1}{k_1} + \frac{1}{k_2}\right)(p_1 - p_2) - \Delta(p_1 - p_2) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{44a}$$

$$p_1(\mathbf{x}) - p_2(\mathbf{x}) = p_{01}(\mathbf{x}) - p_{02}(\mathbf{x}) \qquad \text{on } \partial\Omega \tag{44b}$$

where Δ is the Laplacian operator. Note that

$$\beta\left(\frac{1}{k_1} + \frac{1}{k_2}\right) \geq 0 \tag{45}$$

The above boundary value problem given by equations (44a)–(44b) is a diffusion equation with decay defined in terms of $p_1(\mathbf{x}) - p_2(\mathbf{x})$. Moreover, equation (44a) is a homogeneous partial differential equation, and Dirichlet boundary conditions are prescribed on the entire boundary. From the theory of partial differential equations [Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001], it is well-known that the solutions to such a boundary value problem satisfy a maximum principle, which implies that the non-negative maximum and the non-positive minimum occur on the boundary. Specifically, using [Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, Theorem 1], we conclude that

$$\min\left[0, \min_{\mathbf{x}\in\partial\Omega}[p_{01}(\mathbf{x}) - p_{02}(\mathbf{x})]\right] \leq p_1(\mathbf{x}) - p_2(\mathbf{x}) \leq \max\left[0, \max_{\mathbf{x}\in\partial\Omega}[p_{01}(\mathbf{x}) - p_{02}(\mathbf{x})]\right] \tag{46}$$

□

The main differences between the maximum principles of Darcy equations and the double porosity/permeability model can be summarized as follows:

(i) The maximum principle for the double porosity/permeability model holds for isotropic and homogeneous permeabilities. There are no such restrictions for Darcy equations.

(ii) The body force is assumed to be conservative under the maximum principle for Darcy equations. Such a restriction is not needed for the maximum principle for the double porosity/permeability model.

(iii) The maximum principle for Darcy equations is in terms of the pressure. On the other hand, the maximum principle for the double porosity/permeability model is with respect to the difference in pressures in the macro-pore and micro-pore networks.

(iv) In the case of Darcy equations, the maximum and minimum occur on the boundary. In the case of double porosity/permeability model, the non-negative maximum and the non-positive minimum occur on the boundary.

REMARK 4.4. *It needs to be mentioned that it is possible to extend the above maximum principle to the case in which Neumann boundary conditions are prescribed on a part of the boundary. Such a discussion, however, may need a functional analysis treatment. It is also possible to extend it to weak solutions (i.e., where the difference in pressures is not twice differentiable). But, weak solutions and a functional analysis treatment of the double porosity/permeability model are beyond the scope of this paper. Some of these aspects will be addressed in a sequel paper.*

4.2. Recovery of the classical Darcy equations. The solutions (i.e., the pressure and velocity profiles) under the double porosity/permeability model are, in general, more complicated, and qualitatively and quantitatively different from the corresponding solutions under the classical Darcy equations. However, there are three scenarios under which the solutions under the double porosity/permeability model can be described using the classical Darcy equations. That is, we need to show that there is no mass transfer across the two pore-networks under these scenarios. We now discuss these three scenarios, of which two are trivial.

The *first* scenario is when $\phi_2(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. Physically, this scenario corresponds to the case where there is no micro-pore network in the porous medium. To see mathematically that equations (4a)–(4d) reduce to the classical Darcy equations, one can appeal to equation (4d) and conclude that there is no mass transfer across the pore-networks (i.e., $\chi(\mathbf{x}) = 0$) in the entire domain. Under this condition, equations for the macro-pore network (i.e., equations (4a) and (4c)) will reduce to the classical Darcy equations.

The *second* scenario is when $\mathbf{K}_2(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$. Physically, this scenario corresponds to the case in which the micro-pores are not inter-connected. To show mathematically that one recovers the classical Darcy equations under $\mathbf{K}_2(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$, one can start with equation (6b) and conclude that $\mathbf{u}_2 = 0$. Equation (6d) will then imply that $\chi(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ in the entire domain. Similar to the first scenario, the governing equations for the macro-pore network will reduce to the classical Darcy equations.

The *third* scenario pertains to the case wherein $\mathbf{K}_1(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{K}_2(\mathbf{x})$, and the boundary conditions for the macro-pore and micro-pore networks are the same. That is, $\Gamma_1^p = \Gamma_2^p$, $\Gamma_1^v = \Gamma_2^v$, $p_{01}(\mathbf{x}) = p_{02}(\mathbf{x})$ and $v_{n1}(\mathbf{x}) = v_{n2}(\mathbf{x})$. Note that it is *not* necessary for $\phi_1(\mathbf{x})$ to be equal to $\phi_2(\mathbf{x})$. Under these conditions, flow in the porous medium can be modeled as a single porosity using the classical Darcy equations with porosity equal to $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_1(\mathbf{x}) + \phi_2(\mathbf{x})$. To see that the mass transfer across the pore networks is zero, one can proceed as follows. For convenience, assume $\mathbf{K}_1(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{K}_2(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{x})$.

Then the aforementioned conditions give rise to the following boundary value problem:

$$\mu \mathbf{K}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2\right) + \operatorname{grad}[p_1 - p_2] = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{47a}$$

$$\operatorname{div}[\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2] = -\frac{2\beta}{\mu}(p_1 - p_2) \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{47b}$$

$$(\mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{u}_2(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma^v = \Gamma_1^v = \Gamma_2^v \tag{47c}$$

$$p_1(\mathbf{x}) - p_2(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma^p = \Gamma_1^p = \Gamma_2^p \tag{47d}$$

Clearly, the pair $p_1(\mathbf{x}) - p_2(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ and $\mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{u}_2(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ is a solution to the above boundary value problem (47a)–(47d). By the uniqueness theorem 4.2, this is the only the solution to the above boundary value problem. Since $p_1(\mathbf{x}) = p_2(\mathbf{x})$, the mass transfer across the pore-networks is zero.

In all the above three scenarios, it is important to note that there will be no contribution to the dissipation from the connectors (i.e., conduits/fissures), as there is no flow in the connectors.

5. ANALYTICAL SOLUTION BASED ON GREEN'S FUNCTION APPROACH

In this section, we present an analytical solution procedure for a general boundary value problem arising from the double porosity/permeability model. We provide a formal mathematical derivation based on the Green's function method.

We start by rewriting the governing equations (6a)–(6h). By eliminating $\mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x})$ from these equations, we obtain the following boundary value problem for the macro-pore network:

$$\operatorname{div}\left[\frac{1}{\mu}\mathbf{K}_1(\mathbf{x})\left(\gamma \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) - \operatorname{grad}[p_1]\right)\right] = \chi(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{\beta}{\mu}\left(p_1(\mathbf{x}) - p_2(\mathbf{x})\right) \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{48a}$$

$$\frac{1}{\mu}\widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{K}_1(\mathbf{x})\left(\gamma \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) - \operatorname{grad}[p_1]\right) = u_{n1}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_1^v \tag{48b}$$

$$p_1(\mathbf{x}) = p_{01}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_1^p \tag{48c}$$

By multiplying equation (48a) with G_1, integrating over the domain, employing the Green's identity, and noting the boundary conditions (i.e., equations (48b) and (48c)), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} -\int_\Omega \operatorname{div}\left[\frac{1}{\mu}\mathbf{K}_1 \operatorname{grad}[G_1]\right] p_1 \mathrm{d}\Omega + \int_{\Gamma_1^p} \frac{1}{\mu} G_1 \widehat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \mathbf{K}_1\left(\gamma \mathbf{b} - \operatorname{grad}[p_1]\right) \mathrm{d}\Gamma + \int_{\Gamma_1^v} \frac{1}{\mu}\widehat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \mathbf{K}_1 \operatorname{grad}[G_1] p_1 \mathrm{d}\Gamma \\ = \int_\Omega G_1 \chi \mathrm{d}\Omega + \int_\Omega \frac{1}{\mu}\operatorname{grad}[G_1] \cdot \mathbf{K}_1 \gamma \mathbf{b}\, \mathrm{d}\Omega - \int_{\Gamma_1^v} G_1 u_{n1} \mathrm{d}\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_1^p} \frac{1}{\mu}\widehat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \mathbf{K}_1 \operatorname{grad}[G_1] p_{01} \mathrm{d}\Gamma \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

This suggests to construct the Green's function $G_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ to be the solution of the following boundary value problem:

$$-\operatorname{div}\left[\frac{1}{\mu}\mathbf{K}_1(\mathbf{x}) \operatorname{grad}[G_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]\right] = \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{50a}$$

$$-\frac{1}{\mu}\widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{K}_1(\mathbf{x}) \operatorname{grad}[G_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})] = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_1^v \tag{50b}$$

$$G_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_1^p \tag{50c}$$

where $\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$ denotes the Dirac-delta distribution [Lighthill, 1958]. Then the macro-pressure $p_1(\mathbf{x})$ can be written in terms of mass transfer between the pore-networks $\chi(\mathbf{x})$ as follows:

$$p_1(\mathbf{x}) = \int_\Omega G_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \chi(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\Omega_y + \int_\Omega \frac{1}{\mu} \operatorname{grad}_y[G_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})] \cdot \mathbf{K}_1(\mathbf{y}) \gamma \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y})\, \mathrm{d}\Omega_y$$

$$- \int_{\Gamma_1^v} G_1(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) u_{n1}(\mathbf{y})\, \mathrm{d}\Gamma_y - \int_{\Gamma_1^p} \frac{1}{\mu} \widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{y}) \cdot \mathbf{K}_1(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{grad}_y[G_1(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})] p_{01}(\mathbf{y}) \mathrm{d}\Gamma_y \tag{51}$$

where $\mathrm{d}\Omega_y$ and $\mathrm{d}\Gamma_y$, respectively, denote the volume element and the surface area element with respect to $\mathbf{y}$-coordinates, and the gradient with respect to $\mathbf{y}$-coordinates is denoted by $\mathrm{grad}_y[\cdot]$.

By carrying out a similar procedure for the micro-pore network, the Green's function $G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ is taken to be the solution of the following boundary value problem:

$$-\mathrm{div}\left[\frac{1}{\mu}\mathbf{K}_2(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{grad}[G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})]\right] = \delta(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}) \quad \text{in } \Omega \tag{52a}$$

$$-\frac{1}{\mu}\widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{K}_2(\mathbf{x})\mathrm{grad}[G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})] = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_2^v \tag{52b}$$

$$G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_2^p \tag{52c}$$

The micro-pressure $p_2(\mathbf{x})$ can then be written in terms of $\chi(\mathbf{x})$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} p_2(\mathbf{x}) = &- \int_\Omega G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\chi(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\Omega_y + \int_\Omega \frac{1}{\mu}\mathrm{grad}_y[G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})] \cdot \mathbf{K}_2(\mathbf{y})\gamma\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y})\, \mathrm{d}\Omega_y \\ &- \int_{\Gamma_2^v} G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) u_{n2}(\mathbf{y})\, \mathrm{d}\Gamma_y - \int_{\Gamma_2^p} \frac{1}{\mu}\widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{y}) \cdot \mathbf{K}_2(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{grad}_y[G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})] p_{02}(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\Gamma_y \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Note that $G_1(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ and $G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ are Green's functions for scalar diffusion equations. Since the permeabilities, $\mathbf{K}_1(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{K}_2(\mathbf{x})$, are symmetric tensors, it is easy to establish that the Green's functions, $G_1(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ and $G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$, are symmetric. That is,

$$G_1(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = G_1(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = G_2(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) \quad \forall \mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \tag{54}$$

Equations (51) and (53) give rise to the following integral equation for the mass transfer between the pore-networks:

$$\frac{\mu}{\beta}\chi(\mathbf{x}) + \int_\Omega (G_1(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) + G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}))\chi(\mathbf{y})\, \mathrm{d}\Omega_y = h(\mathbf{x}) \tag{55}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbf{x}) := &\int_\Omega \frac{1}{\mu}\left(\mathbf{K}_2(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{grad}_y[G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})] - \mathbf{K}_1(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{grad}_y[G_1(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})]\right) \cdot \gamma\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\Omega_y \\ &+ \int_{\Gamma_1^v} G_1(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) u_{n1}(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\Gamma_y + \int_{\Gamma_1^p} \frac{1}{\mu}\widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{y}) \cdot \mathbf{K}_1(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{grad}_y[G_1(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})] p_{01}(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\Gamma_y \\ &- \int_{\Gamma_2^v} G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) u_{n2}(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\Gamma_y - \int_{\Gamma_2^p} \frac{1}{\mu}\widehat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{y}) \cdot \mathbf{K}_2(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{grad}_y[G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})] p_{02}(\mathbf{y})\mathrm{d}\Gamma_y \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Equation (55) is a non-homogeneous Fredholm integral equation of second type with symmetric kernel [Tricomi, 1957]. The symmetry of the kernel stems from the fact that the Green's functions, $G_1(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ and $G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$, are symmetric.

The overall analytical solution procedure can be compactly written as follows:

(i) Construct the Green's functions, $G_1(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ and $G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$, that are, respectively, the solutions of the boundary value problems given by equations (50) and (52).

(ii) Using $G_1(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ and $G_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$, solve the integral equation (55) to obtain the mass transfer between the pore-networks $\chi(\mathbf{x})$.

(iii) Using the solution for $\chi(\mathbf{x})$, compute the pressures, $p_1(\mathbf{x})$ and $p_2(\mathbf{x})$, using equations (51) and (53), respectively.

(iv) Once the pressures, $p_1(\mathbf{x})$ and $p_2(\mathbf{x})$, are known, the discharge velocities, $\mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{u}_2(\mathbf{x})$, can be computed using equations (6a) and (6b).

The solution procedure presented above is quite general, as it can be applied even to those problems with anisotropic and heterogeneous medium properties. The procedure is built upon obtaining Green's functions for scalar diffusion equations and solving a linear scalar Fredholm integral equation of second type. There are numerous existing works that provide Green's functions for scalar diffusion equations (e.g., see [Stackgold, 1998]). A good deal of work exists on Fredholm integral equations in terms of mathematical theory, analytical solutions, and numerical techniques. For instance, see [Atkinson, 1997; Kanwal, 1996; Polyanin and Manzhirov, 2008; Tricomi, 1957].

REMARK 5.1. *The boundary value problems corresponding to the Green's functions assumed* Γ_1^p *and* Γ_2^{p} *to be non-empty. That is, it is assumed that there is a (non-empty) portion of the boundary on which Dirichlet boundary conditions are prescribed. One needs to modify the procedure if velocity boundary conditions are prescribed on the entire boundary for a pore-network, which gives rise to a boundary value problem with Neumann boundary conditions for the construction of the Green's function for that particular pore-network. However, one can find in the literature procedures to construct modified Green's functions for diffusion-type equations with Neumann boundary conditions; for example, see [Stackgold, 1998]. This aspect will be illustrated in subsection 6.2.*

6. CANONICAL BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS

6.1. One-dimensional problem #1. Consider a one-dimensional domain of length L. For the macro-pore network, pressures p_1^{L} and p_1^{R} are prescribed on the left and right ends of the domain, respectively. Similarly, pressures of p_2^{L} and p_2^{R} are, respectively, prescribed on the left and right ends of the domain for the micro-pore network. The purpose of this boundary value problem is four-fold:

(i) The problem will be used to illustrate the various steps in the analytical solution procedure that was presented in Section 5.
(ii) It will be shown that the integral equation (55) can provide the appropriate and consistent boundary conditions for the mass transfer across the pore-networks in terms of the prescribed velocity and pressure boundary conditions.
(iii) It will be shown the maximum and minimum pressures need not occur on the boundary under the double porosity/permeability model for a boundary value problem with pressures prescribed on the *entire* boundary. On the contrary, the maximum and minimum pressures occur on the boundary under Darcy equations for a pressure-prescribed boundary value problem.
(iv) The maximum principle proposed in Theorem 4.4 will be numerically verified.

6.1.1. *Non-dimensionalization.* We take the length of the domain L [L], $p_1^{\mathrm{L}} - p_1^{\mathrm{R}}$ [$\mathrm{ML^{-1}T^{-2}}$], and β/μ [$\mathrm{M^{-1}L^2T}$] as the reference quantities. We also take the datum for the pressure to be p_1^{R}. These reference quantities give rise to the following non-dimensional quantities, which are denoted by a superposed bar:

$$\overline{x} = \frac{x}{L},\ \overline{p}_1 = \frac{p_1 - p_1^{\mathrm{R}}}{p_1^{\mathrm{L}} - p_1^{\mathrm{R}}},\ \overline{p}_2 = \frac{p_2 - p_1^{\mathrm{R}}}{p_1^{\mathrm{L}} - p_1^{\mathrm{R}}},\ \overline{k}_1 = \frac{k_1}{L^2},\ \overline{k}_2 = \frac{k_2}{L^2},\ \overline{\mu} = \frac{\mu}{\mu_{\mathrm{ref}}},\ \overline{u}_1 = \frac{u_1}{u_{\mathrm{ref}}},\ \overline{u}_2 = \frac{u_2}{u_{\mathrm{ref}}} \tag{57}$$

where

$$\mu_{\text{ref}} := \frac{\mu L}{\beta},\ u_{\text{ref}} := \frac{\beta}{\mu}\left(p_1^{\text{L}} - p_1^{\text{R}}\right) \tag{58}$$

The non-dimensional form of the governing equations can be written as follows:

$$\frac{\overline{\mu}}{\overline{k}_1}\overline{u}_1 + \frac{d\overline{p}_1}{d\overline{x}} = 0,\ \frac{\overline{\mu}}{\overline{k}_2}\overline{u}_2 + \frac{d\overline{p}_2}{d\overline{x}} = 0,\ \frac{d\overline{u}_1}{d\overline{x}} = -(\overline{p}_1 - \overline{p}_2),\ \frac{d\overline{u}_2}{d\overline{x}} = +(\overline{p}_1 - \overline{p}_2) \quad \text{in } (0,1) \tag{59a}$$

$$\overline{p}_1(\overline{x}=0) = 1,\ \overline{p}_1(\overline{x}=1) = 0,\ \overline{p}_2(\overline{x}=0) = \overline{p}_2^{\text{L}},\ \overline{p}_2(\overline{x}=1) = \overline{p}_2^{\text{R}} \tag{59b}$$

The mass transfer from the macro-pore network to the micro-pore network takes the following form:

$$\overline{\chi}(\overline{x}) = \overline{p}_2(\overline{x}) - \overline{p}_1(\overline{x}) \tag{60}$$

In this boundary value problem, $\overline{k}_1$ and $\overline{k}_2$ are assumed to be independent of $\overline{x}$. For simplicity, we drop the over-lines, as all the quantities below will be non-dimensional quantities.

6.1.2. *Analytical solution.* For convenience, let us introduce the following parameter:

$$\eta := \sqrt{\frac{\mu\,(k_1 + k_2)}{k_1 k_2}} \tag{61}$$

Note that η is inversely proportional to the square root of the harmonic average of the permeabilities in the macro-pore and micro-pore networks. The Green's functions $G_1(x,y)$ and $G_2(x,y)$ will be:

$$\frac{k_1}{\mu}G_1(x,y) = \frac{k_2}{\mu}G_2(x,y) = \begin{cases} x - xy & x \le y \\ y - xy & x > y \end{cases} \tag{62}$$

The integral equation for the mass transfer becomes:

$$\chi(x) - \int_0^1 \eta^2 xy\chi(y)\mathrm{d}y + \int_0^x \eta^2 y\chi(y)\ \mathrm{d}y + \int_x^1 \eta^2 x\chi(y)\ \mathrm{d}y = h(x) \tag{63}$$

Using the Leibniz integral rule and noting that $h''(x) = 0$, the above equation implies that

$$\frac{d^2\chi}{dx^2} = \eta^2\chi \tag{64}$$

The boundary conditions for the mass transfer $\chi(x)$ in terms of the prescribed boundary pressure conditions take the following form:

$$\chi(x=0) = h(x=0^+) = p_2^{\text{L}} - 1 \tag{65a}$$

$$\chi(x=1) = h(x=1^-) = p_2^{\text{R}} \tag{65b}$$

The solution of the boundary value problem given by equations (64) and (65a)–(65b), which will also be the solution of the integral equation (63), takes the following form:

$$\chi(x) = C_1\exp[\eta x] + C_2\exp[-\eta x] \tag{66}$$

where

$$C_1 = \frac{p_2^{\text{R}} + (1 - p_2^{\text{L}})\exp[-\eta]}{\exp[\eta] - \exp[-\eta]} \quad \text{and} \quad C_2 = -\frac{p_2^{\text{R}} + (1 - p_2^{\text{L}})\exp[\eta]}{\exp[\eta] - \exp[-\eta]} \tag{67}$$

The solution for the pressures in the macro-pore and micro-pore networks can be written as follows:

$$p_1(x) = \underbrace{1 - x}_{\text{Darcy solution}} \underbrace{- \frac{\mu}{k_1\eta^2}\left\{\left(1 - p_2^{\text{L}}\right)(1 - x) - p_2^{\text{R}}x + C_1\exp[\eta x] + C_2\exp[-\eta x]\right\}}_{\text{deviation due to mass transfer}} \tag{68a}$$

$$p_2(x) = \underbrace{p_2^{\mathrm{L}}(1-x) + p_2^{\mathrm{R}} x}_{\text{Darcy solution}} + \underbrace{\frac{\mu}{k_2 \eta^2} \left\{ \left(1 - p_2^{\mathrm{L}}\right)(1-x) - p_2^{\mathrm{R}} x + C_1 \exp[\eta x] + C_2 \exp[-\eta x] \right\}}_{\text{deviation due to mass transfer}} \tag{68b}$$

The solution for the discharge velocities in the pore-networks can be written as follows:

$$u_1(x) = \underbrace{\frac{k_1}{\mu}}_{\text{Darcy solution}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{\eta^2}\left(p_2^{\mathrm{L}} - p_2^{\mathrm{R}} - 1\right) + \frac{1}{\eta}\left(C_1 \exp[\eta x] - C_2 \exp[-\eta x]\right)}_{\text{deviation due to mass transfer}} \tag{69a}$$

$$u_2(x) = \underbrace{\frac{k_2}{\mu}\left(p_2^{\mathrm{L}} - p_2^{\mathrm{R}}\right)}_{\text{Darcy solution}} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{\eta^2}\left(p_2^{\mathrm{L}} - p_2^{\mathrm{R}} - 1\right) - \frac{1}{\eta}\left(C_1 \exp[\eta x] - C_2 \exp[-\eta x]\right)}_{\text{deviation due to mass transfer}} \tag{69b}$$

The deviation of the solution under the double porosity/permeability model from that of the corresponding solution under Darcy equations is indicated in the above expressions for the analytical solution. One fact that is clear from the analytical solution is that the nature of the solution (i.e., the pressure and velocity profiles) depend on the parameter η.

Figure 2 illustrates that the maximum and minimum pressures for macro-pore and micro-pore networks need not occur on the boundary. On the other hand, as mentioned earlier, the maximum and minimum pressures occur on the boundary under Darcy equations for a boundary value problem with pressures prescribed on the entire boundary. Figure 3 numerically verifies the maximum principle proposed in Theorem 4.4 for the double porosity/permeability model. As one can see from this figure, the non-negative maximum and the non-positive minimum of the pressure difference, $p_1(x) - p_2(x)$, occur on the boundary under the double porosity/permeability model.

6.2. One-dimensional problem #2. In this problem, pressure boundary conditions are applied on the macro-pore network, and no-flux (i.e., zero normal velocity) boundary conditions are enforced on the micro-pore network. This problem highlights the following important points:

(i) One can have discharge (i.e., non-zero velocity) in the micro-pore network even if the micro-pore network does not extend to the boundary (i.e., there is no discharge on the boundary of the micro-pore network). This implies that, for complicated porous media, it is essential to know the internal pore-structure (e.g., using μ-CT [Stock, 2008]). It does not suffice to know the surface pore-structure on the boundary.

(ii) One can find the solution uniquely for all the fields (i.e., pressures, velocities, and mass transfer) even if the velocity boundary conditions are prescribed on the entire boundary for one of the pore-networks. On the other hand, one cannot find the pressure uniquely under Darcy equations if the velocity boundary conditions are prescribed on the entire boundary.

(iii) This problem will be utilized to illustrate the construction of modified Green's function for problems involving velocity boundary conditions for either macro-pore or micro-pore network.

We shall employ the same reference quantities, as defined in problem #1. The non-dimensional form of the governing equations for this boundary value problem can be written as follows:

$$\frac{\mu}{k_1} u_1 + \frac{dp_1}{dx} = 0,\ \frac{\mu}{k_2} u_2 + \frac{dp_2}{dx} = 0,\ \frac{du_1}{dx} = -(p_1 - p_2),\ \frac{du_2}{dx} = +(p_1 - p_2) \quad \text{in } (0,1) \tag{70a}$$

$$p_1(x=0) = 1,\ p_1(x=1) = 0,\ u_2(x=0) = 0,\ u_2(x=1) = 0 \tag{70b}$$

The expression for the mass transfer across the pore-networks is the same as before.

6.2.1. *Analytical solution.* The Green's function $G_1(x, y)$ will be:

$$G_1(x,y) = \frac{\mu}{k_1} \begin{cases} x - xy & x \leq y \\ y - xy & x > y \end{cases} \tag{71}$$

Since the boundary value problem for the micro-pore network has Neumann boundary conditions on the entire boundary, one needs to modify the procedure for finding the Green's function. Following the technique provided in [Stackgold, 1998], the Green's function $G_2(x, y)$ is constructed in such a way that it satisfies the following boundary value problem:

$$-\frac{\mu}{k_2}\frac{d^2G_2}{dx^2} = \delta(x-y) - 1 \quad \text{in } (0,1), \qquad \frac{\mu}{k_2}\frac{dG_2}{dx}\bigg|_{x=0} = 0, \qquad \frac{\mu}{k_2}\frac{dG_2}{dx}\bigg|_{x=1} = 0 \tag{72}$$

The Green's function $G_2(x, y)$ takes the following form:

$$G_2(x,y) = \frac{\mu}{k_2} \begin{cases} \frac{x^2}{2} - y + C_0 & \text{for } x \leq y \\ \frac{x^2}{2} - x + C_0 & \text{for } x > y \end{cases} \tag{73}$$

where C_0 is a constant which needs to be determined. It should be noted that C_0 is independent of x, but could depend on y. The integral equation for the mass transfer becomes:

$$\chi(x) + \int_0^1 p_2(y)dy - \frac{1}{k_1}\int_0^1 xy\chi(y)\mathrm{d}y + \frac{1}{k_2}\int_0^1 (C_0 + x^2/2)\chi(y)\mathrm{d}y + \int_0^x \left(\frac{y}{k_1} - \frac{x}{k_2}\right)\chi(y)\mathrm{d}y + \int_x^1 \left(\frac{x}{k_1} - \frac{y}{k_2}\right)\chi(y)\ \mathrm{d}y = h(x) \tag{74}$$

Using the Leibniz integration rule, the integral equation (74) can be shown to be equivalent to the following differential equation:

$$\frac{d^2\chi}{dx^2} + \frac{1}{k_2}\int_0^1 \chi(y)\mathrm{d}y = \eta^2\chi(x) \tag{75}$$

where the parameter η is defined in equation (61). The solution for the above differential equation takes the following form:

$$\chi(x) = D_1 \exp[\eta x] + D_2 \exp[-\eta x] \tag{76}$$

Using the boundary conditions one can find that

$$D_1 = \frac{k_1 + k_2}{k_1\eta(\exp[\eta] + 1) + 2k_2(\exp[\eta] - 1)} \quad \text{and} \quad D_2 = -\exp[\eta]D_1 \tag{77}$$

The analytical solution can be compactly written as follows:

$$p_1(x) = 1 - x - \frac{1-2x}{2 + \coth[\eta/2]\frac{k_1\eta}{k_2}} - \frac{\mu}{k_1}\frac{1}{\eta^2}\left(D_1\exp[\eta x] + D_2\exp[-\eta x]\right) \tag{78a}$$

$$p_2(x) = 1 - x - \frac{1-2x}{2 + \coth[\eta/2]\frac{k_1\eta}{k_2}} + \frac{\mu}{k_2}\frac{1}{\eta^2}\left(D_1\exp[\eta x] + D_2\exp[-\eta x]\right) \tag{78b}$$

$$u_1(x) = \frac{k_1}{\mu} - \frac{k_1}{\mu}\frac{2}{2 + \coth[\eta/2]\frac{k_1\eta}{k_2}} + \frac{1}{\eta}(D_1\exp[\eta x] - D_2\exp[-\eta x]) \tag{78c}$$

$$u_2(x) = \frac{k_2}{\mu} - \frac{k_2}{\mu}\frac{2}{2 + \coth[\eta/2]\frac{k_1\eta}{k_2}} - \frac{1}{\eta}(D_1\exp[\eta x] - D_2\exp[-\eta x]) \tag{78d}$$

Note that one cannot find $p_2(x)$ uniquely under Darcy equations, as the boundary conditions for the micro-pore network are all velocity boundary conditions. All one can say about the solution for $p_2(x)$ under Darcy equations is that it is an arbitrary constant. On the other hand, one can find uniquely the solution for $p_2(x)$ under the double porosity/permeability model.

6.2.2. *Comparison with Darcy equations.* If only the macro-pore network is present, the boundary conditions of the macro-pore network imply that the pressure and the velocity take the following form:

$$u_1(x) = \frac{k_1}{\mu} \quad \text{and} \quad p_1(x) = 1 - x \tag{79}$$

If only the micro-pore network is present, the boundary conditions of the micro-pore network imply that

$$u(x) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad p(x) = \text{arbitrary constant} \tag{80}$$

If the standard permeability test is performed on a porous medium (which has both pore-networks) the permeability will be:

$$k_{\text{eff}} = \mu u_1(0) = \frac{k_1 + k_2}{2\tanh[\eta/2]\frac{k_2}{k_1\eta} + 1} \tag{81}$$

Equation (81) implies that one can relate the experimental value of the effective permeability to the permeabilities of macro- and micro-pore networks. This clearly shows the need to know the internal pore-structure for an accurate modeling of porous media.

Figure 4 shows the variation of velocities in micro-pore and macro-pore networks and the mass transfer across the pore-networks for various values of η and for two different cases $k_1 < k_2$ and $k_1 > k_2$. It is observed that although there is no supply of fluid on the boundaries of the micro-pore network, there will still be discharge (i.e., non-zero velocity) within the micro-pore network. This reveals that the internal pore-structure is an important factor characterizing the flow in a complicated porous medium. One can analyze the internal pore-structure using modern techniques such as μ-CT. In other words, the surface pore-structure cannot solely specify the flow within the domain. Moreover, whether the permeability of the macro-pores is larger or smaller than the permeability of the micro-pores, we will still have flow in the micro-pore network.

Figure 5 compares the velocities under the double porosity/permeability model and the Darcy equations. Here, the permeability used in the Darcy equations is the effective permeability introduced in equation (81). Macro- and micro-velocities and their summation (i.e., $u_1 + u_2$) under the double porosity/permeability model as well as the velocity under the Darcy equations are displayed. As it can be seen for both cases $k_1 > k_2$ and $k_1 < k_2$, under the Darcy equations the velocity throughout the domain for this one-dimensional boundary value problem is a horizontal line where the constant value is equal to the summation of the macro- and micro-velocities under the double porosity/permeability model. This implies that the effective permeability $k = k_{\text{eff}}$, which is obtained by the classical Darcy experiment, cannot completely capture the complex internal pore-structure of the porous medium. This is due to the fact that the experimental value obtained for k_{eff} does not account for the case of multiple pore-networks within the domain. It just assumes a single pore-network, and the effective permeability is calculated based on the surface pore-structure of the specimen.

6.3. Two-dimensional boundary value problem. This problem pertains to the flow of water in candle filters, which are widely used for purifying drinking water [Dickenson, 1997]. Consider a circular disc of inner radius $r_i = a$ and outer radius of $r_o = 1$. The inner surface of the cylinder is subjected to a pressure, and the outer surface of the cylinder is exposed to the atmosphere. For the micro-pore network, there is no discharge from the inner and outer surfaces of the cylinder. Figure 6 provides a pictorial description of the problem.

We shall employ cylindrical polar coordinates. Noting the underlying symmetry in the problem, the variables, u_1, u_2, p_1 and p_2, are assumed to be functions of r only. The governing equations can be written as follows:

$$\frac{\mu}{k_1}u_1 + \frac{dp_1}{dr} = 0, \quad \frac{\mu}{k_2}u_2 + \frac{dp_2}{dr} = 0, \quad \frac{1}{r}\frac{d(ru_1)}{dr} + (p_1 - p_2) = 0,$$
$$\frac{1}{r}\frac{d(ru_2)}{dr} - (p_1 - p_2) = 0 \quad \forall r \in (a, 1) \tag{82a}$$
$$p_1(r = a) = 1, \quad p_1(r = 1) = 0, \quad u_2(r = a) = 0, \quad u_2(r = 1) = 0 \tag{82b}$$

This implies that the mass transfer $\chi(r)$ satisfies the following differential equation:

$$\chi^{''} + \frac{1}{r}\chi^{'} - \eta^2\chi = 0 \tag{83}$$

which is a (homogeneous) modified Bessel ordinary differential equation [Bowman, 2010]. A general solution to the above ordinary differential equation can be written as follows:

$$\chi(r) = p_2(r) - p_1(r) = C_3 I_0(\eta r) + C_4 K_0(\eta r) \tag{84}$$

where $I_0(z)$ and $K_0(z)$ are, respectively, zeroth-order modified Bessel functions of first and second kinds. Noting that $I_0^{'}(z) = I_1(z)$ and $K_0^{'}(z) = -K_1(z)$, the analytical solution can be written as follows:

$$p_1(r) = \frac{\ln[r]}{\ln[a]}C_1 + C_2 - \frac{\alpha_1}{\eta^2}\left(C_3 I_0(\eta r) + C_4 K_0(\eta r)\right) \tag{85a}$$
$$p_2(r) = \frac{\ln[r]}{\ln[a]}C_1 + C_2 + \frac{\alpha_2}{\eta^2}\left(C_3 I_0(\eta r) + C_4 K_0(\eta r)\right) \tag{85b}$$
$$u_1(r) = -\frac{k_1}{\mu}\frac{C_1}{r\ln[a]} + \frac{1}{\eta}\left(C_3 I_1(\eta r) - C_4 K_1(\eta r)\right) \tag{85c}$$
$$u_2(r) = -\frac{k_2}{\mu}\frac{C_1}{r\ln[a]} - \frac{1}{\eta}\left(C_3 I_1(\eta r) - C_4 K_1(\eta r)\right) \tag{85d}$$

The boundary conditions give rise to the following coefficients:

$$C_1 = \delta\eta^2 a\ln[a]\left(I_1(a\eta)K_1(\eta) - I_1(\eta)K_1(a\eta)\right)\alpha_2, \quad C_3 = \delta\eta^3(aK_1(a\eta) - K_1(\eta)),$$
$$C_2 = \delta\left(-1 + a\eta I_1(a\eta)K_0(\eta) + a\eta I_0(\eta)K_1(a\eta)\right)\alpha_1, \quad C_4 = \delta\eta^3(aI_1(a\eta) - I_1(\eta)) \tag{86a}$$

where

$$\delta^{-1} = \left(-2 + a\eta I_1(a\eta)K_0(\eta) + \eta I_1(\eta)K_0(a\eta) + \eta I_0(a\eta)K_1(\eta) + a\eta I_0(\eta)K_1(a\eta)\right)\alpha_1 +$$
$$\eta^2 a\ln[a]\left(I_1(a\eta)K_1(\eta) - I_1(\eta)K_1(a\eta)\right)\alpha_2 \tag{87}$$

For comparison, the pressure and the discharge velocity under Darcy equations with constant permeability k and with boundary conditions $p(r = a) = 1$ and $p(r = 1) = 0$ can be written as

follows:

$$p(r) = \frac{\ln[r]}{\ln[a]} \quad \text{and} \quad u(r) = -\frac{k}{\mu}\frac{1}{r\ln[a]} \tag{88}$$

It is evident that the velocity and pressure profiles under the double porosity/permeability model are much more complicated than the corresponding profiles under Darcy equations. Figure 6 illustrates the qualitative difference between the pressures under the double porosity/permeability model and Darcy equations. The graph of the pressures under Darcy equations is always convex while the graph of the macro-pressure under the double porosity/permeability model has both convex and concave parts. It should also be noted that, although there in no discharge from the micro-pore network on the boundary, there is discharge in the micro-pore network within the domain.

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, several contributions have been made to the modeling of fluid flow in porous media with double porosity/permeability. *First*, a thermodynamic basis for double porosity/permeability model using the maximization of rate of dissipation hypothesis has been provided. The mass transfer across the macro-pore and micro-pore networks has been obtained in a systematic manner by treating it as an internal variable and maximizing a prescribed (physical) dissipation functional. *Second*, various mathematical properties that the solutions under the double porosity/permeability model satisfy have been presented along with their proofs. *Third*, a maximum principle has been established for the double porosity/permeability model, which is in terms of the difference in pressures in the macro-pore and micro-pore networks. The main differences between the maximum principles of Darcy equations and the double porosity/permeability model have been discussed. *Fourth*, an analytical solution procedure based on the Green's function method has been presented for a general boundary value problem under the double porosity/permeability model. *Fifth*, conditions under which the response under the double porosity/permeability model can be adequately described by Darcy equations have been discussed. *Last but not the least*, using the analytical solutions of some canonical problems, the salient features of the pressures and velocities in the macro-pore and micro-pore networks under the double porosity/permeability model have been highlighted. Some of the significant findings of the paper can be summarized as follows:

(C1) In general, the pressure and velocity profiles under the double porosity/permeability model are qualitatively and quantitatively different from the corresponding solutions under the classical Darcy equations. This difference can be attributed to the complex nature of the porous medium with double porosity/permeability. However, there are situations under which the solutions under the double porosity/permeability model can be adequately described by Darcy equations.

(C2) The maximum and minimum pressures need not occur on the boundary under the double porosity/permeability model. This is in contrast with the case of Darcy equations under which the maximum and minimum pressures occur on the boundary for a pressure-prescribed boundary value problem.

(C3) The solution under the double porosity/permeability model is unique even for those boundary value problems in which pressure conditions are prescribed on the entire boundary for either macro-pore network or micro-pore network. This is not the case with Darcy equations, as the pressure can be found up to an arbitrary constant if pressure conditions are prescribed on the entire boundary.

(C4) There will be discharge in the micro-pore network even if there is no fluid supply on the boundaries of the micro-pore network. Therefore, it can be concluded that the surface pore-structure is not the only factor in characterizing the flow through a complex porous medium which highlights the need to use modern techniques (e.g., μ-CT) for studying the internal pore-structure.

(C5) Comparison of velocities under the double porosity/permeability model and the Darcy equations with effective permeability revealed that the effective permeability obtained by the classical Darcy experiment cannot capture the complex internal pore-structure since it does not account for the case of multiple pore-networks within the domain.

(C6) There will be mass transfer across the two pore-networks whether the permeability of the macro-pore network is greater than the permeability of the micro-pore network or vice-versa. This means that the path that the fluid takes is not necessarily through the network with higher permeability.

An interesting extension of the research presented herein can be towards the study of the flow of multi-phase fluids in a porous medium with double porosity/permeability. Another research endeavor can be towards coupling the deformation of the porous solid with the flow in a porous medium with double porosity/permeability.

References

B. Amaziane and L. Pankratov. Homogenization of a model for water–gas flow through double-porosity media. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, 2015.

T. Arbogast, Jr. J. Douglas, and U. Hornung. Derivation of the double porosity model of single phase flow via homogenization theory. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 21:823–836, 1990.

R. J. Atkin and R. E. Craine. Continuum theories of mixtures: Basic theory and historical development. *The Quarterly Journal of Mechanics and Applied Mathematics*, 29:209–244, 1976.

K. E. Atkinson. *The Numerical Solution of Integral Equations of the Second Kind*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 1997.

A. S. Balogun, H. Kazemi, E. Ozkan, M. Al-Kobaisi, and B. A. Ramirez. Verification and proper use of water-oil transfer function for dual-porosity and dual-permeability reservoirs. In *SPE Middle East Oil and Gas Show and Conference*. Society of Petroleum Engineers, 2007.

G. I. Barenblatt, I. P. Zheltov, and I. N. Kochina. Basic concepts in the theory of seepage of homogeneous liquids in fissured rocks [strata]. *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics*, 24:1286–1303, 1960.

R. I. Borja and A. Koliji. On the effective stress in unsaturated porous continua with double porosity. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 57:1182–1193, 2009.

C. Boutin and P. Royer. On models of double porosity poroelastic media. *Geophysical Journal International*, 203:1694–1725, 2015.

F. Bowman. *Introduction to Bessel Functions*. Dover Publications, New York, 2010.

H. C. Brinkman. On the permeability of the media consisting of closely packed porous particles. *Applied Scientific Research*, A1:81–86, 1947.

T. C. Dickenson. *Filters and Filtration Handbook*. Elsevier, New York, fourth edition, 1997.

R. C. Dykhuizen. A new coupling term for dual-porosity models. *Water Resources Research*, 26: 351–356, 1990.

L. C. Evans. *Partial Differential Equations*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1998.

D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*. Springer, New York, 2001.

R. P. Kanwal. *Linear Integral Equations: Theory and Technique*. Birkhäuser, Boston, second edition, 1996.

M. J. Lighthill. *An Introduction to Fourier Analysis and Generalised Functions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 1958.

A. E. H. Love. *A Treatise on the Mathematical Theory of Elasticity*. Cambridge University Press, New York, third edition, 1920.

S. Lowell, J. E. Shields, M. A. Thomas, and M. Thommes. *Characterization of Porous Solids and Powders: Surface Area, Pore Size and Density*. Springer Science & Business Media, New York, 2012.

A. D. Polyanin and A. V. Manzhirov. *Handbook of Integral Equations*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, second edition, 2008.

M. H. Sadd. *Elasticity: Theory, Applications, and Numerics*. Academic Press, Burlington, Massachusetts, 2009.

M. Shabouei and K. B. Nakshatrala. Mechanics-based solution verification for porous media models. *Communications in Computational Physics*, accepted, 2016.

J. Šimunek, N. J. Jarvis, M. Th. van Genuchten, and A. Gärdenäs. Review and comparison of models for describing non-equilibrium and preferential flow and transport in the vadose zone. *Journal of Hydrology*, 272:14–35, 2003.

I. Stackgold. *Green's Functions and Boundary Value Problems*. Wiley Interscience, New York, 1998.

S. R. Stock. *Microcomputed Tomography: Methodology and Applications*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2008.

F. G. Tricomi. *Integral Equations*. Interscience Publishers, New York, 1957.

M. Th. van Genuchten and P. J. Wierenga. Mass transfer studies in sorbing porous media I. Analytical solutions. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 40:473–480, 1976.

T. Vogel, H. H. Gerke, R. Zhang, and M. Th. van Genuchten. Modeling flow and transport in a two-dimensional dual-permeability system with spatially variable hydraulic properties. *Journal of Hydrology*, 238:78–89, 2000.

J. E. Warren and P. J. Root. The behavior of naturally fractured reservoirs. *Society of Petroleum Engineers Journal*, 3:245–255, 1963.



FIGURE 1. Porous media and their idealizations: dual-porosity model and double porosity/permeability model. In the upper part of the figure, the idealization of flow through a fractured porous medium using the dual-porosity model is shown. The bottom part, idealizes the fluid flow in a porous medium with two pore-networks using the double porosity/permeability model. The arrows represent the fluid pathways and the mass transfer within the domain.



FIGURE 2. One-dimensional problem #1: Variation of micro-pressure and macro-pressure in the one-dimensional domain. For comparison, the analytical solution under Darcy equations is also plotted. The maximum and minimum pressures in both the pore-networks need not occur on the boundary in the case of double porosity/permeability model. The parameter η is defined in equation (61).



(a) $0 = p_1^{\mathrm{R}} < 0.3 = p_2^{\mathrm{R}} < p_2^{\mathrm{L}} = 0.9 < p_1^{\mathrm{L}} = 1$ (b) $0 = p_1^{\mathrm{R}} < 0.9 = p_2^{\mathrm{R}} < p_1^{\mathrm{L}} = 1 < p_2^{\mathrm{L}} = 1.5$

FIGURE 3. One-dimensional problem #1: This figure numerically verifies the maximum principle given by Theorem 4.4. According to the maximum principle, $p_1(x) - p_2(x)$ in the entire domain lies between the non-negative maximum and non-positive minimum values on the boundary. Note that the medium properties are isotropic and homogeneous.



(a) Macro-velocity for $k_1 < k_2$

(b) Macro-velocity for $k_1 > k_2$

(c) Micro-velocity for $k_1 < k_2$

(d) Micro-velocity for $k_1 > k_2$

(e) Mass transfer for $k_1 < k_2$

(f) Mass transfer $k_1 > k_2$

FIGURE 4. One-dimensional problem #2: Variation of the macro-velocity, micro-velocity and mass transfer for various η values for the cases $k_1 < k_2$ and $k_1 > k_2$. Although there is no supply of fluid on the boundaries of the micro-pore network, there is still a discharge (i.e., non-zero velocity) in the micro-pore network, and there is a mass transfer across the pore-networks.



(a) Case 1: $k_1 = 1.0$ and $k_2 = 0.1$ (b) Case 2: $k_1 = 0.1$ and $k_2 = 1.0$

FIGURE 5. One-dimensional problem #2: This figure compares the velocities under double porosity/permeability model and Darcy model for the cases $k_1 > k_2$ and $k_1 < k_2$. Macro-and micro-velocities and their summation under the double porosity/permeability model as well as the velocity under the Darcy model with $k = k_{\text{eff}}$ are displayed. As it can be seen, k_{eff} obtained by the classical Darcy experiment cannot capture the complex internal pore-structure.



FIGURE 6. Two-dimensional boundary value problem: The left figure provides a pictorial description of the problem. There is no discharge on the inner and outer surfaces of the micro-pore network. For the macro-pore network, the inner surface is subjected to a pressure of unity, and the outer surface is subjected to a pressure of zero. The right figure illustrates that the macro-pressure under the double porosity/permeability model is qualitatively different from the pressure under Darcy equations.